I.   Objection To Drawings

The Examiner objected to the Figures 1 and 4 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), indicating that

Figures 1 and 4 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art -- because purportedly only

that which are old are illustrated.   To further prosecution, Applicants respectfully request

changes to the drawings according to the Examiner's request.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d), enclosed is a copy of Figures 1 and 4 labeled

"Replacement Sheet" in the page header of each drawing. This will show proposed changes

thereto for which approval of the Examiner is requested. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request withdrawal of this objection.

II.   35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-3, 8-12 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,055,998). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Wright et al. does not teach or suggest "converting further compris[ing] evaluating one or

more formulas" as recited, for example, in claim 1. The portion of Wright et al. cited with respect

to claim 1 states "[w]hen an expression 1511 is entered into the display of cell 1503, the

spreadsheet program immediately computes the expression's value and displays the value in the cell

1503. . . . Similarly, when a user changes the value of a cell 1503 whose value is used to compute

the values of other cells, the spreadsheet program immediately recomputes all of the other values.

When a user is finished working on a spreadsheet, the spreadsheet program saves the representation

of the spreadsheet in non volatile storage such as a disk drive." (Col. 20, ll., 22-37; emphasis

added). The cited portion of Wright et al. merely discusses computing a value of a cell in a

spreadsheet. There is no "converting" discussed in this portion and no "evaluating one or more

formulas" comprised in the "converting." Claim 1 recites, for example, "converting said spreadsheet file to a second format wherein said converting further comprises evaluating one or more formulas." (Emphasis added.) Furthermore, the end of the cited portion of Wright et al. confirms that there is no converting involved, stating that the spreadsheet representation is simply saved "in non volatile storage such as a disk drive."

The rejection to claim 8 is respectfully traversed for similar reasons. The cited portions of Wright et al. do not teach or suggest converting comprising compiling code that is readable by a small device.

Claim 10 is not unpatentable over Wright et al for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not unpatentable over Wright et al. Claims 2-3, 8-9 and 11-12, 16-17 depend upon claims 1 and 10 respectively and are also therefore not unpatentable.

Claims 4-7 and 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Pajokowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,425). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the claims. Claims 4-7 and 13-16 depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively and therefore are not unpatentable for at least the same reasons.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited

prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 3, 2005   By: _____

Kimani P. Clark
Registration No. 45,969

Customer No.: 26263
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Phone: 202/ 408-9214
Fax: 312/ 876-7457